THEOLOGY

VOL. LIII FEBRUARY, 1950 No. 356

Editorial

THAT preaching is not what it was is a commonplace observation, but the inquiry whether preaching can ever again become what it used to be is not yet commonplace. The preacher in future is likely to have not less but more competition from the radio, the cinema, and the popular newspaper. Yet it is estimated that about fifty thousand sermons are still preached in England and Wales every Sunday. This figure represents a vast output of endeavour which seems to produce nothing commensurate in the way of tangible returns. The question arises whether the Church's witness and work would not be better served by the direction of much of this endeavour into other channels. Moreover, is it reasonable to expect preachers to go on indefinitely preparing and delivering sermons in such profusion for the benefit of what in very many cases is only a handful of hearers? Apparently, the church and chapel goers that remain like to have it so, but might they not soon be persuaded that it would be better for everyone concerned that fewer and better sermons should be preached? The work of persuasion will have to be carried out locally, but the church authorities could give it impetus and encouragement. One thing they might usefully do is to have a new book of Homilies prepared, which could on occasion be used in place of the sermon. (This has already been done in New Zealand, we have been told.) Every deacon ordained in the Church of England swears that he will "read . . . Homilies in the church." Why should he not be enabled to keep this promise?

But this leaves on our hands the bigger question whether the pulpit can ever regain its traditional function and importance in the life of the Church. Dr W. E. Sangster, in his excellent book *The Craft of Sermon Construction* (Epworth Press, 7s. 6d.), begins by examining the implications of this question, and advances weighty reasons for believing that "neither literature, broadcasting, nor the cinema, can displace preaching in the purpose of God." He sets out, and deals faithfully and understandingly with, the grounds on which preachers themselves are nowadays inclined to lose confidence in the worthwhileness of their task. But he has done better than that. He has produced a profound and practical account of the preacher's craft, which will be serviceable in every Christian communion. That it will be useful to ordination candidates goes without saying, but Dr Sangster has also had in mind the needs of laymen who are called to preach, and also of clergymen who are discouraged or stale in this essential part of their ministry.

He accepts Bernard Manning's definition of a sermon, "A manifestation of the Incarnate Word, from the Written Word, by the

spoken word," and classifies sermons, first, according to their subject-matter; secondly, according to their structural type; and, thirdly, according to their psychological method. It is a merit that he is not an advocate of any one method or style of preaching, but allows for many legitimate varieties, though he shows the corruptions into which each may sink. He has fresh and valuable things to say about the beginning and conclusion of sermons, about methods of preparation, and about mistakes commonly made. The busy parish priest will often feel that he is receiving counsels of perfection, and he will certainly be moved to desire that he could devote more time and care to the preparation of fewer sermons. Thus we return to the need, we noted above, to decrease the quantity, and to increase the quality, of preaching. There is no other way by which the pulpit can recover its proper authority in the Church, and draw men, who knowingly or unknowingly are hungry for the Word of God, to the place where it can be most effectively delivered—*i.e.*, in the congregation of faithful men.

* * * * *

This Grace wherein we Stand, by Dr G. J. Jeffrey (Hodder and Stoughton, 6s.), is also a book about the preacher's task. It contains the Warrack Lectures delivered to the students of New College, Edinburgh, and St Mary's College, St Andrews, in 1948. This is an altogether slighter volume than Dr Sangster's, but it gives the moving testimony of an elderly minister to his unabated confidence in his commission.

Two volumes of sermons have also been published recently. Those collected in *Faith Stakes a Claim*, by the Rev. Leslie E. Cooke, General Secretary of the Congregational Union (Independent Press, 6s.), are workmanlike but without particular distinction. *Thirty Minutes to Raise the Dead* by the Rev. D. R. Davies (Canterbury Press, 8s. 6d.), has a fine title, and these sermons are strong, pungent, and spiced with humour and some wholesome vulgarity. The theme of most of them, however, is too monotonous. It would seem that, if Mr Davies actually had thirty minutes in which to raise the dead, he would spend most of the time in labouring the point that they really were dead.

Non-established Anglicanism[1]

THE time is past when the very phrase "non-established Anglicanism" would have seemed not merely paradoxical but unmeaning. Yet such a time there was, and it is not very remote from our own. So I begin this paper by celebrating the centenary of a notable and highly significant utterance of John Henry Newman. It is to be found in his *Discourses to Mixed Congregations*, which was the first book he published after becoming an Oratorian father; its chapter number is XII, and its title "Prospects of the Catholic Missioner."

[1] A paper read to an Anglo-Swedish Conference at Whitby in June, 1949.

The whole book is dedicated to Dr Wiseman, Bishop of Melipotamus and Vicar Apostolic of the London District, who had so large a share in Newman's conversion to Rome four years before; and the discourses which compose it breathe the exaltation of a zealous neophyte who believes himself to have exchanged the fleshpots of Egypt for the milk and honey of the Promised Land. In the discourse now before us he is pointing out the contrast between these two ecclesiastical territories, Anglican and Roman.

His first aim is to establish the contrast between sects and heresies on the one hand and Rome on the other, and for the purpose of his argument he includes "the Arabian imposture, of which Mahomet was the founder," in the former class. What he calls the Greek Schism, or a heresy like Nestorianism, or Calvinism, or Methodism —and the list might be extended indefinitely—are all marked, he says, by one fatal defect; they are all local and sectional affairs; "each has its geographical limits," whereas Roman Catholicism alone, through its unique possession of a divinely bestowed internal principle, is capable of subduing men in any and every time and place. Then he turns specifically to Anglicanism, and his words must be quoted at some length.

The Anglican Communion, he says, "is found in many parts of the world; its Primate has a jurisdiction even greater than the Nestorian Patriarch of old. It has establishments in Malta, in Jerusalem, in India, in China, in Australia, in South Africa, and in Canada. Here, at least, you will say, is Catholicity, even greater than that of Mahomet. Oh, my brethren, be not beguiled by words; will any man say for a moment, whatever this objection be worth, that the Established religion *is* superior to time and place? . . . rather, does not its essence lie in its recognition by the State? Is not establishment its very form? What would it be, would it last ten years if abandoned to itself? It is its establishment which erects it into a unity and individuality; can you contemplate it, though you stimulate your imagination to the task, abstracted from its churches, palaces, colleges, parsonages, civil precedence, and national position? Strip it of this world, and it has been a mortal operation, for it has ceased to be. Take its bishops out of the Legislature, tear its formularies from the Statute Book, open its universities to Dissenters, let the secularization of its clergy be legal, remove the civil penalty from its prayer-meetings, and what would be its definition? You know that, did not the State compel it to be one, it would split at once into three several bodies, each bearing within it the elements of further divisions. It has then no internal consistency, or individuality, or soul, to give it the capacity of propagation. Methodism represents some sort of an idea, Congregationalism an idea; the Established religion has in it no idea beyond Establishment. Its extension has been, for the most part, passive, not active; it is carried forward into other places by State policy, and it moves because the State moves; it is an appendage, whether weapon or decoration, of the sovereign power; it is the religion, not even of a race, but of the ruling portion of a race . . . the religion of a class."

When Newman uttered these words a century ago, he intended them to have a disturbing effect on all Anglicans who were alive to spiritual issues, especially those who had shared his own earlier hopes of a Catholic revival within the Establishment itself, but had not shared either the profound despondency which had overwhelmed him when his efforts seemed to have failed, or the logic which led him to a change of ecclesiastical allegiance. So his object here is to point out to all thinking Anglicans how impossible it really was for any would-be Catholic to remain a member of the Established Church of England, and content with a form of religion which owed such survival-value as it had solely to the fact that it was Established. He pictures Anglicanism not merely as insular but as the religion of a class only, and he finds in this fact the explanation for the existence of Anglicanism in more distant parts of the world; it has reached India, China, Canada, and other lands not through active zeal in preaching the gospel, but as an automatic accompaniment of the English governing class, whose members had gone abroad for purely secular purposes—the Establishment following the flag. But the Anglican Church in itself has no spiritual power or life or principle of cohesion; apart from the Establishment it would cease to be.

That there are elements of truth in Newman's criticisms I am not concerned to deny; and remembering the stresses of his own spiritual pilgrimage, we may be charitably indulgent to his rhetorical exuberance. But as we read his words after the lapse of a century, we cannot but find in them the strongest possible grounds for encouragement. We might well have had searchings of heart had we been his contemporaries and constrained to face the issue on which Newman made one decision and Keble and Pusey the other. Keble and Pusey never despaired of the Church of England; Newman did, and in this discourse he sets before us the reasons which led to that despair, and which ought, in his view, to have the same effect on all clear-sighted and spiritually sensitive Anglicans. He sets himself to expose the hollowness of the whole Anglican system as a mere vassal of the State, a crown marionette, with no true life of its own; wholly dependent on State action not merely for such significance as it may seem to have, but for its very existence. To him the title of this paper—"Non-established Anglicanism"—would have been a contradiction in terms.

What makes Newman's picture so encouraging to Anglicans to-day is the light thrown upon it by a century of history and of practical experience over a wide field. Read in this new light his prophecy of the future of Anglicanism under certain conditions is seen to be quite beside the mark, a period piece of wishful thinking. We can now appeal from forecasts to facts. And though we may plead guilty to some of his charges, his whole discourse is refuted, by the facts, with devastating thoroughness. Even in Britain, and still more in many other parts of the world, Anglicanism has continued to grow and flourish in separation from Establishment, and the dubious patronage of the civil power. Even in England a great part of what

would constitute, in Newman's view, a "mortal operation" on the Established Church has taken place, and no one to-day can suppose that it would suffer from internal injury if its bishops were removed from the House of Lords, or its formularies torn from the Statute Book. Indeed, the latter process is heartily desired by a very large number of churchmen, and the former, though it would be regretted for Parliament's sake, would be accepted with equanimity. And outside England, where the Anglican Communion is subject to all these supposedly lethal conditions, the patient remains disconcertingly alive, and has not even "split into three several bodies."

So our centenary retrospect enables us to put Newman's argument in reverse, with cheering results. If his diagnosis of Anglicanism had been correct, its future, under the conditions indicated, would have been what he confidently foretold. It may or may not be a source of weakness to the Church of England that she happens to be established; there is plenty of room for argument here. But two points are certain—first, that its disestablishment would have very little effect on its real life, and in Wales at least the process has been decidedly invigorating; and secondly, that the past century has witnessed an astonishing growth of Anglicanism in all parts of the world and under conditions altogether free from Establishment's artificial aid. To Newman, the Establishment was the very essence and form of Anglicanism; to us, non-established Anglicanism is the norm and the establishment in England a local and irrelevant anomaly. It is interesting to speculate what Newman might have said, or thought, had he been able to foresee the Lambeth Conference of 1948 with its more than three hundred bishops from a large variety of races and from every corner of the earth, or the celebration of the Fourth Centenary of the English Prayer Book the next year, or if he had been in a position to look back on 250 years of the S.P.C.K., and an almost equally long period of service by the S.P.G. He might still have regarded Anglicanism as unsatisfactory, but at least he would have retracted, one must hope, the argument set forth in this particular discourse.

It was indeed inevitable that the fact of the Establishment should loom much larger in the minds of English Christians 100 years ago than it does to-day. When the Oxford Movement began it seemed obvious that the Church of England was a purely English institution, though not necessarily the worse on that account; obvious, too, that it had hardly emerged at all from the narrow limits, national and territorial, which had marked it since the Reformation. It seemed also to be somnolent and ineffective, and the efforts of the Tractarian writers to recall it to a sense of supernatural vocation had only emphasized, in Newman's eyes, the hopelessness of the task. Yet since he left us the miracle has happend; the small local church, the religion of a class, as he called it, has increased and mutiplied and proved itself independent not merely of Establishment but of national and cultural limitations also. It has developed into a world-wide fellowship. This is an alluring theme, but not one which we can rightly pursue further at the moment. But it seems

worth while to set against Newman's idea of Anglicanism the statement which was approved by the Lambeth Conference of 1930.

> "The Anglican Communion is a Fellowship, within the one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, of those duly constituted Dioceses, Provinces, or Regional Churches in communion with the See of Canterbury, which have the following characteristics in common:
>
> "(*a*) They uphold and propagate the Catholic and Apostolic faith and order as they are generally set forth in the Book of Common Prayer as authorized in their several churches;
>
> "(*b*) They are particular or national churches, and, as such, promote within each of their territories a national expression of Christian faith, life, and worship; and
>
> "(*c*) They are bound together not by a central legislative and executive authority, but by mutual loyalty sustained through the common counsel of the Bishops in conference."

In short, what Anglicans see in Anglicanism is a non-papal Catholicism which is capable of much growth yet, but has already grown to so remarkable an extent that we may thank God and take courage; in need, doubtless, of many improvements and enrichments, yet firmly based on historical and theological truth; essentially independent of establishment and secular support, yet ready and anxious to serve any state where it is found, in Christ's name; and because it is truly Catholic in aim and constitution, making an appeal which is, in principle, of force *ubique, semper, omnibus.*

We may now turn to the one concrete example of Non-established Anglicanism, of which I have had first-hand experience for several years, the Church in Scotland. Here, as in Wales, we find an Anglican Church not merely non-established, but disestablished and disendowed. But the general situation is quite different from that in Wales, and there is a long and very tangled history behind it. The current myth is that there is something about the Scottish character which makes Presbyterianism its only authentic expression in the religious sphere, and that Episcopacy is merely an alien infiltration from England. It is true enough that Presbyterianism is the established church of the country, and has an immense preponderance in numbers and influence, and that Presbyterians are apt to speak, often quite innocently, of the "English Church" when they refer to an Episcopalian place of worship. Anglicans are, in Scotland, a tiny minority. But we are not discouraged by that fact, and our own Dr Anthony Mitchell's short history bears the gallant title of *Scotland's Church*, and provides a reasoned vindication of this Episcopalian pretension. The corruption of the medieval Church in Scotland had gone further than in England, and the reaction against it was correspondingly greater, overthrowing that Apostolic order which in England was most carefully preserved. But there was a party which sought reform on Catholic lines, and it is this party which is represented by the Episcopal Church to-day. Though outwardly and numerically a sect, she refuses to regard herself in that light; as the sole representative in Scotland of non-papal Catholicism, she believes that she has something to offer which is of the

greatest spiritual importance. Indeed, she would have no excuse for existing in a predominantly Presbyterian country but for the obligation, stressed in her first canon, of maintaining and bearing witness to the Catholic and Apostolic Ministry. This is her vocation, and there is nothing narrow or sectional about it.

And there is much to encourage, chiefly perhaps the fact that if Christendom is ever to be reunited, it can only be on the basis of Episcopacy. A Congregationalist minister who became an Anglican some thirty-five years ago, at considerable cost to himself, told me at the time that what made him take this step was the recognition that the body to which he then belonged could never be the centre of a reunited Church. This statement seemed to me then, and seems still, highly significant, for it indicates a test to which every Christian denomination should submit itself. In Scotland, consequently, we are not intimidated by the overwhelming numbers of Presbyterianism; there is not the least hope that Christians generally will ever be united on a Presbyterian basis, and to the best of my belief no Presbyterian who takes the quest for reunion seriously and is competent to judge the issues, would maintain the contrary opinion. But results may yet come, by the good hand of God upon us, if we can steadily combine personal friendship towards our Presbyterian neighbours with a firm maintenance of our Catholic principles.

I have said that Anglicans are in a tiny minority in Scotland; this is the result not of a plebiscite, nor of the inherent and irresistible Scottishness of the Presbyterian system, but of grievous and sustained persecution by the State. Presbyterianism was established for the first time in 1592; in 1610 a valid Episcopate was restored. The second establishment of Presbyterianism took place in 1638, and was largely due to the unwisdom of the methods by which Charles I prosecuted his conscientious ecclesiastical policy. With the restoration of Charles II came the second restoration of the Episcopate; but the final disestablishment of Episcopacy was effected in 1689, for purely political reasons, by William III. At this time Episcopalians were in a majority; but they were all Jacobites, and William not only occupied the throne of James II, but was also a Dutch Calvinist. The next year Presbyterianism was established by Act of Parliament, at a time when there were only sixty-one ministers in the country who thought themselves entitled to create a General Assembly and made any attempt to do so. The bishops and some six hundred of the clergy were expelled from this new erastian and minority establishment. For the next few years the Presbyterians did what they could, often with military assistance, to eject Episcopal incumbents from their parishes, but as late as 1707 there were still 165 of them in occupation. The accession of Queen Anne brought some relief, especially the Toleration Act of 1712, which gave liberty of worship to Episcopalians, the right to use the English Prayer Book, and constitutional recognition of what was called "The Episcopal Communion." But the worst times came after the good queen's death in 1714, chiefly as a result of the two Jacobite risings in 1715 and 1745. In Dr Mitchell's words, "The whole power of the

Hanoverian Government was so vindictively exercised to work [the Church's] ruin that it seems wonderful that she emerged at all from her tribulation." And the result of this relentless persecution was to reduce her, in Sir Walter Scott's famous phrase, to "the shadow of a shade." Penal laws were passed in 1719, 1746, and 1748. By the time that these laws were repealed, in 1792, the 600 priests of a century before had dwindled to forty, with four bishops, and Episcopalians in the country generally, from a preponderance of something like two to one, to a minority which has been estimated is of one in twenty, or rather less. It was not until 1864 that the penal disabilities were finally removed.

These historical events have been briefly mentioned in order to bring out two special features in the position occupied by the Non-established Anglicanism in Scotland—first, that Anglicanism here is not merely non-established but disestablished, and has been persecuted almost out of existence; and secondly, that the country has an established religion—Presbyterianism. Exactly what the practical effect of these two features has been it is not easy to estimate, but the possible dangers to the Anglican minority are plain enough, and it would be optimistic to claim that we have been quite unaffected by them. The first danger is that of taking a romantic rather than a realistic view of the present position and task. The Church would have escaped much suffering and much weakness had not our forebears cherished too romantic a view of the House of Stuart; and we in turn need to be careful not to take too sentimental a view of our own past, of the persecuted and faithful remnant which we represent to-day. The second danger is multiform; the very existence and size of the Establishment may tempt us to leave to Presbyterians some tasks which we ought to be tackling ourselves, or to be envious of their nation-wide parochial organization, or to be lacking in evangelistic zeal and energy, and content merely to look after our own Episcopalian folk, as though we were a sect, organized according to our private preferences, and existing more for our own edification than for the propagation of the Faith.

In these and other ways it is all too easy to fail in our task, but the task itself, the task of witnessing to Catholic faith and order in a Calvinistic environment, is not only worth doing with all our might, for its own sake, it is also one which can be undertaken hopefully. It is true that the definite "High Church" movement among Presbyterians has not come to very much, outwardly, but there has been a widespread growth of Churchmanship and sacramentalism amongst Presbyterian ministers, and of a readiness to accept Catholic doctrines, except on the subject of the Ministry. It is here that Episcopalian influence has a real opportunity, and the very fact that the Anglican witness in Scotland is borne by a Church which is not merely non-established but disestablished—deprived, in Newman's words, of its "churches, palaces, colleges, parsonages, revenues, civil precedence and national position"—and for long proscribed, adds force to that witness and emphasizes the value attached to it by the Church concerned. There is a very obstinate and deep-rooted garden

weed which defies almost all attempts to dislodge it—it is known in Scotland as bishop's weed—and I like to think that this is a term not merely of opprobrium but also of a certain respect for sheer tenacity. (It is perhaps a little odd, though not, I think, significant, that the same plant in England goes by the name of "ground *elder*.")

But perhaps the advantages and opportunities of the non-established status of Anglicanism in Scotland may best be illustrated by three events in our history; they are all familiar and need not be enlarged upon, but they cannot be overlooked.

The first of these events was the publication of the Scottish liturgy in 1764. There is a good deal of fascinating history behind this event, and the event itself was epoch-making, the most important Anglican contribution to Liturgical Worship which had been made since 1662—and possibly since 1552 or even 1549. And it was made by a disestablished Church while the penal laws were still in full rigour. Humanly speaking, it would never have been produced had Anglicanism remained the Established Kirk of Scotland. I am not concerned here to estimate its merits or its subsequent influence beyond a solitary quotation from Bishop Dowden. He writes, that its "true reflection of the spirit of primitive devotion, and the unquestionable merits which it possesses as a formulary of worship, have won the admiration of theologians and Liturgiologists of high eminence. As it stands, it is a worthy monument of the learning and piety of the Scottish Church."

The second event followed twenty years later, in 1784, when the Primus, Kilgour, and Bishops Skinner and Petrie, consecrated Dr Samuel Seabury as bishop, and so gave the Episcopate to the United States of America. The Church Establishment in England involved the taking of the oath of Royal Supremacy by everyone who was consecrated therein to the office and work of a bishop. It was precisely because the Scottish Church was not established, and was therefore free from all such requirements, that application for Seabury's consecration was made to the Scottish bishops.

The third event is much more recent. The work of Prayer Book revision in the early part of this century was being carried out in England and Scotland simultaneously; the new English book is dated 1928 and the Scottish 1929. And there was a great deal of consultation and pooling of ideas between the two committees concerned. The results in England even to-day are profoundly unsatisfactory; there is a deadlock which is not and cannot be adequately resolved by any interim administrative policy on the part of the English Bench. It is no doubt true that one reason for the unhappy fate of the original "Deposited Book" was the knowledge that its object was not solely the glorifying of God through richer and fuller methods of worship, but also the disciplining of the clergy. None the less, it was the fact of Establishment, with all its consequences in the way of Parliamentary control and interference, which led to the unedifying debacle of the book's rejection. In Scotland, on the contrary, there were no such complications and handicaps. The Provincial Synod was free to undertake its works of revision as

a purely liturgical task, with no uneasy glance forward at possible political repercussions; at the same time such disciplinary and administrative matters as needed attention were dealt with by a revision of the canons, also promulgated in 1929. The then Primus wrote a foreword to this revision in which he justly remarks: "Our code of Canons is not a dead letter but a living document. It contains the rules by which our Church in Scotland is governed. Incidentally it illustrates the history of the growth of the Church."

The temptation to say a good deal more about the position and opportunities of the Episcopal Church in Scotland must be resisted; I would only add that those who come to serve in it from the Established Church south of the border find the change of ecclesiastical climate definitely refreshing. As one small but significant example of this I may cite the question of reservation. In England this has been a party question productive of much controversial heat; in Scotland the practice is taken for granted as a reasonable provision for pastoral needs, and it is accepted as blameless by all schools of thought. For it is worth while to emphasize that there are different schools of thought in Scotland; the differences escape notice because they seldom provoke serious controversy, but Episcopalianism in Scotland is not the monochrome block of High Churchmen which it is sometimes imagined to be in the south.

Finally, we may turn from more local examples of non-established Anglicanism to consider very briefly the general *principle* of Ecclesiastical Establishment. Establishment, as found in England, has certain definite advantages over and above the value attaching to State recognition of the Christian Faith. It gives an incumbent the charge of all the souls in his parish, whatever in practice their denominational allegiance may be; it gives him a right of entry, generally speaking, into all homes by virtue of his office; it means that the Church is officially represented on occasions of public importance, and in other ways enjoys a prestige which does not attach to the non-established denominations; and it is in far less danger of degenerating into a sect by withdrawing into itself and forgetting its missionary duty to the whole nation.

On the other hand, the very prestige enjoyed by an Established Church is a possible source of danger; it may lead to a confusion of spiritual values; to laying stress on the State connexion rather than on the Church's own divinely given constitution and mission; the state appointment of bishops, though it has worked surprisingly well, may become disastrous at any moment; Parliamentary control over such intimate Church concerns as her liturgical forms is quite intolerable; the notorious but still prevalent formula "C. of E." means that among the adherents of the Establishment are included a large number of merely nominal Christians, a dead weight which has to be carried somehow; and in consequence there is a weakness of Catholic family feeling and coherence.

Fortunately it is not our immediate concern to decide or even discuss the question whether the Church of England would be likely to gain more than it would lose, or lose more than it would

gain, by being disestablished. But it is our concern to point out the positive advantages, and perhaps also the disadvantages, which belong to the position of non-established Anglicanism; and I feel confident that very few of those who have had the experience of non-established Anglican life would prefer to find themselves members of an Established Church.

One last point ought not to be forgotten. There is a danger which may soon become of practical and crucial importance to Anglicans as it already is to many of our fellow-Christians in different parts of the world. This is the danger of nationalism, and especially of a nationalism which does not openly aim at the destruction of the Christian Faith, but professes to encourage that expression of Christianity which is most suited to each nation concerned. Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Bulgaria are obvious examples; so was Japan during the war; how far the process has gone in Russia it is not easy to discern. It is good and right that the Church in every nation should be truly national, embodying and expressing the particular gifts and calling with which God has blessed this or that people; the glory and the honour of each nation is to be brought into the Holy City, and the Creator has not imposed a uniform pattern upon them all. Nevertheless, every nation needs to be baptized into Christ and remade thereby; it is the nation which is to be transformed into His likeness, not His likeness which is to be adapted to the tastes and ideology of the nation. Catholicism can never be merely national; it must also and always be *supra*-national, because it must obey God rather than man. If the Church in any nation becomes *infra*-national, taking its orders from the secular power and acting towards it as a pliable court chaplain, then it has lost its Catholicism, its savour, and its soul. If this crucial choice ever faces the Church of England, I have little doubt that by the grace of God it will make the right decision; and I think it will be greatly helped to do so by the vigorous and independent life, in many parts of the world, of non-established Anglicanism.

✠Eric Brechin.

The Claims of the Free Churches: Some Disclaimers

Dr Henry Townshend's *The Claims of the Free Churches* was not written, he says, in any official capacity. But it comes with the experience and authority of a distinguished Free Church leader, and for all I know, what he has to say may come much nearer than my views to the official "party line" of those Free Church representatives engaged in the Lambeth conversations. If I venture some comments, I hope without impertinence, they must be understood as coming from that Divine Right of Balaam's ass, which I take to be the genuine theological core of the Priesthood of all Believers.

When, recently, Mr Ernest Payne gave us a sensitive, balanced estimate of the Free Church contribution to the life of England, it was an impressive sum-total. It showed plainly that no account of

the Catholic faith in England could make sense which did not take account of the Free Churches. It revealed that one kind of high Anglican polemic which borrowed its terminology rather from Scottish song ("Gin a body meet a body") than from the New Testament is an evasion of the problem, and that to write off the Free Churches as "bodies" is to treat the problem of *nos frères separés* less seriously than some modern Roman theologians. But this exchange of "claims" and counter-claims by Anglicans and Free Churchmen is a relapse, explicable, no doubt, but nevertheless a relapse, into an unhappy dialectic forced upon us in the past by church conflict. It is a dialectic which could still poison the Ecumenical Movement. An ingenious mind might even compose an ecumenical card game, with different coloured cards for each communion and on each card a grievance or a truculent claim—"John Penry," "Gunpowder Plot," "The Jesuit Martyrs," etc.—and we could all play ecclesiastical "Beat your neighbours out of doors": it would get us just as far as talking at each other is likely to take us towards genuine Christian reconciliation. Indeed, this obsession of Christian men with "claims" has more affinity than we may care to believe with a secular society sick because it has allowed duties to be lost sight of in a grab at rights—even if we grant that both the "rights" and the "claims" have their origin in past injustice. I am sure there are very many things about the past in Dr Townshend's book which Anglicans need to hear, and it is important for all our sakes that they should be told them. It is even more important that they should be told them, not by Free Churchmen, but by Anglicans. That is the great lesson won for the Ecumenical Movement by the German Evangelical Church in the great Stuttgart Declaration, that where there is an estrangement between Christians, and when the Church must speak in such a situation, its speech must always be *Coram Deo* and never simply *Coram hominibus*, and so must always begin with repentance and confession of sin. But granted that this kind of conversation had to be conducted, Dr Townshend has written with learning and insight, and what follows here must assume a wide area of agreement and respectful appreciation of very much that he has written.

A Methodist cannot become as agitated as Dr Townshend over episcopacy. His work rings with the word "bishop" (or "Essential Ministry") as often as the epistles of St Ignatius, though with somewhat different intention. What is more disturbing is the statement (p. 16) "Anglo-Catholic writers think the Church of God began with Abraham." I had not imagined that any other view would square with the Biblical writers to whom Dr Townshend makes supreme appeal, and notably St Paul and the writer to the Hebrews. True, it would be better to begin a study of Church History, as does Père de Lubac (a Jesuit!) with Adam, and with God's mercy's whole design towards mankind. But can we deny the continuing existence of the People of God in Israel and the Church which is the New Israel without destroying the biblical proclamation, without breaking the story of redemption into a kind of theological "Itma," a series of disconnected theological conversations

carried on in different accents? It is true that in a further remark Dr Townshend (p. 23) indicates his real objection to be against the equation of the People of God with what St Paul calls "Israel after the flesh." Here is a problem which ecumenical theologians will need to ponder—namely, the meaning of the historical nexus between "Israel after the Spirit" and "Israel after the flesh": could the precious, prophetic burden of one have survived without the continuous existence (*divina permissione*) of the other? And, applied to Church history, what is the relation between the "Church under the Cross," the *communio sanctorum* of Protestant, and the "Essence of Catholicism" and "Mystical Body" of Catholic, ecclesiology on the one hand, and the totality of institutional religion on the other?

When Dr Townshend says (p. 19) "I do not need reminding that good men are serving conscientiously in Institutional Churches," we must take him to exclude the Free Churches from his definition of "Institutional." But is not here a fallacy which has produced the real sectarianism? Is it not to misunderstand the deep gravamen of the New Testament indictment of institutional religion, above all in the Epistle to the Romans, which shows us, on the summit of the pyramid of human sin and disobedience, Ecclesiastical Man: and have we not had painful occasion to learn in a side of Free Church history too little regarded in Dr Townshend's pages, that Ecclesiastical Man includes Protestant Man, Puritan, and Nonconformist Man? Is it not dangerous error to imagine that we can contract out of the whole story of the Institutional Church, and dissolve our pedigree into isolated pockets of "purely spiritual" religion? Must not the Christian realize his place with the sins of all Christian men in all Christian communions, in all Christian centuries, and that he stands (to quote again the Men of Stuttgart) "in a solidarity of guilt" in which, and only in which, can be realized the Priesthood of All Believers, since only here does he stand in the solidarity of the spotless Lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world?

That is the real criticism of Dr Townshend's failure adequately to recognize the shadows in our history. Are there really no elements in the story (speaking *Coram Deo* and not attempting to weigh comparative injustices, after the manner of men) of Puritan fanaticism (Penry, Rainsborough,), cruel intolerance (witch-hunting), lack of charity (have Baptists never split from Baptists or Methodists from Methodists, and only for the highest motives?), and covetousness (Richard Oastler's flaming exposure of some Huddersfield Nonconformists)? Yet it is precisely at this point that the Free Churchman needs to be most wary. Though, by conviction, and by reason of past persecution, he must put the case against Establishment, the Free Churchman must never suppose that because the Free Churches are not established politically and juridically, they are free from the responsibility, temptation, and entanglement of history, and very earthy history at that, including the fact of power. For, in fact, though he affirms that in its beginning "English Nonconformity was a purely spiritual movement," the plea becomes difficult to sustain in later days when a troop of Cromwell's horse could contemplate

becoming. as a unit, a "gathered Church," or when governments shook and Cabinet ministers resigned at the political repercussions of the "Nonconformist Conscience." For all Dr Townshend's criticism of Luther, had his teaching about resistance been followed, the welter of religious wars might have been averted: it is left-wing Protestantism (with sword in one hand and Bible in the other—Ulrich Zwingli to Oliver Cromwell) which must face graver charges at the bar of history. But economic privilege means an equally dangerous temptation, though Free Church preoccupation with the evils of Establishment may disguise the fact: to reflect the ethos of a prosperous bourgeoisie, to have affairs in the Church handled by wealthy laymen (of the highest personal character) eminent in public life, is to be exposed to precisely the same temptation of secularization, at a more subtle level, as the members of the *eigenkirche* of a tenth-century Lord of the Manor. But when Dr Townshend calls the last half of the nineteenth century "the golden age of Nonconformity," we wonder what exactly are the measuring rods. Was it truly an age of gold or was it "sounding brass"? I would not minimize the great and splendid contribution of Victorian Nonconformity to our English religious life, and have tried elsewhere to pay tribute to it:[1] but it must be firmly suggested that in Church history "in all time of our wealth" finds more urgent place in Christian supplication than "in all time of our tribulation." Were the deepest impulses of truth, liberty, and democracy, which were contributed by Nonconformity, those of her heyday in the nineteenth century or those made when she numbered a few persecuted thousands in the seventeenth century? Dr Townshend might retort that he is thinking of the grand moral authority of Nonconformity as exercised by men like R. W. Dale. But it has to be answered that this still involves power. Any schoolboy knows that the threat of the stick, the promise of a bar of chocolate, and to be "put on one's honour," are three kinds of the same pressure.

One has to ask seriously, when faced with the power and prestige of late nineteenth-century Nonconformity, whether in addition to its splendid religious and moral achievement it had not become entangled in the pressures of history, and acquired that "bubble gum" quality which Luther so profoundly diagnosed in the late medieval papacy whereby a corporate system becomes inflated like a balloon, only to be pricked, and to collapse, and to find its authority and prestige gone with the wind, if not with the Liberal Party. Moreover, it is the fate of all golden ages that the thought of them turns us wistfully backward: in a revolutionary world is it not dangerous to suppose we might make a program from nostalgia? Could it lead to anything more than a gallant series of rearguard actions defending a nineteenth-century agenda of ethical priorities, and missing the drastic and enormous readjustments which all the modern Churches are called to make?

Dr Townshend gives us plenty of statistics. The curious may ob-

[1] In *The Ideas and Beliefs of the Victorians*, 1948.

serve (p. 40) that the Methodist Churches between them number almost as many members as the other Free Churches put together. If it be not taken as a mark of denominational arrogance, one might have expected to find some faint recognition of the fact in the proportions of this book. It is almost unbelievable, but in a work of 320 pages less than one page is devoted to the Evangelical Revival, and the few lines given to John Wesley are less than those devoted to Whitfield or to Archbishop Laud. For the rest about half a dozen pages go to the nineteenth-century Methodism, almost all accompanied by some criticism or other. It is true the praise is warm, even eloquent, and the brevity excused with "I cannot pause longer over this mighty event." But one is driven to ask, "Why ever not?" What was there to hinder the devotion of a chapter to the rise and crystallization of Methodism, and to its effect on the Free Churches, by flinging those innumerable fresh divisions into the struggle to relieve disabilities at a critical point? Can anything really excuse the fact that in this same chapter ten whole pages are devoted to "Pluralism and Absenteeism" among the Anglican clergy (which anybody can read, as Dr Townshend admits, in the pages of Professor Sykes, together with the admission—which he does not quote —that on the Continent these surviving medieval abuses had been swept away by the bishops' "Essential Ministry" in the Counter Reformation!).

Let it be recorded, then, that the largest constituent member of the Free Churches came into being in the eighteenth century in more intimate association with Anglicanism than any other separated body, and that despite all that has happened since (and it would be foolish to ignore it) Methodism bears in its life the impress of that association: that from the days of Wesley until now there have been very many Methodists who rejoice in the hymns of the Wesleys, in a liturgy of Holy Communion and Morning Prayer which links them with the Prayer Book, and that they are hindered by no doctrinaire conceptions of Church polity or sacramental rigidity from seeking closer relations with the Church of England.

That is not the whole story. Modern Methodism proudly includes other elements stemming from nineteenth-century Dissent. They look back gratefully to the sturdy independence of the Primitive Methodist radicals, the Christian chartists (the banner "More Pigs and Less Bishops" should please Dr Townshend) and the Durham miners. But they might also be grateful to the Wesleyan tradition which ensured the coherent survival of Methodism through the age of revolution, which prevented the movement being entangled with political Dissent, and which had its sociological and political tradition more in line with Edmund Burke and John Wesley than their two opponents, Priestley and Price, the Unitarians whom Dr Townshend praises with glacial fervour. We may have more need than we know to recall that tradition. For if the failure of the Church through many centuries has been its capitulation to pressure from the possessing classes, and systems of power of the Right, this century may yet demonstrate the equally disastrous apostasy of a Chris-

tianity which merely reflects the operative idealism of revolutionary man.

Dr Townshend does scant justice to T. S. Eliot's profound treatment of a "Christian Society." His quotations from Eliot, Dawson, Maritain might be balanced by equally foolish statements on the near-Pacifist Left by distinguished Free Churchmen in the long silly season 1929-39. What was demanded was some recognition that Mr Eliot's views (apart from his ignorance of the Free Churches, which may be granted) have behind them a long tradition going back through Coleridge, via Frederick Denison Maurice, a tradition to which in fact the Nonconformist social gospel of H. P. Hughes and even R. W. Dale was itself indebted.

The book raises inevitably the question of the future of this alliance of the Free Churches. It was a fruitful alliance in the nineteenth century when Free Churchmen fought shoulder to shoulder and Anglicans can hardly grumble if memories prove long. It was sharpened by the sheering away of the Nonconformist Right under the impact of the Oxford Movement. But we must realize that, golden age or no, there will be no return to the conditions of the late Victorian Age. As Free Churchmen we have to recognize the portent of the Ecumenical Movement. It was Dr Scott Lidgett, who once told an archbishop that Methodists would never make a unilateral approach to Anglicanism apart from their Free Church brethren, who recently proclaimed "the days of the old stark denominationalism are over" (a remark as cryptic as the archbishop's Cambridge sermon, but like it illuminating and hopeful). Now we must look beyond the existence of the Churches to a revolutionary world the outlines of which we can only dimly discern, but which by shattering our sociological foundations will profoundly affect religious tensions and loyalties.

There are those who wonder whether the Free Church alliance has anything to say to an estranged humanity that the British Council of Churches cannot say more effectively? Much of what, historically, has been their witness is now the common property of all the Churches. Even the case against Episcopacy as put by Dr Townshend might be left to the acidities of the *Church Times* about those who "seek to lord it over the Church of God," and to the comments of members of the Lower House of Convocation which denounces almost every form of the episcopate in history, and almost every living personal embodiment of the episcopal office with a gusto which leaves Nonconformists agape, wondering what is the meaning of the new *theologia negativa* which cannot tell us what a bishop really is, but only what a *shaliach* is not.

For, perhaps Dr Townshend would agree, Free Churchmen do not need to think in terms of a "golden age": "The Church under the Cross"—as distinct from the "Church under the weather"—does not need even faintly to sigh about its past. It speaks not in terms of this or that age, or *aion*, but in terms of certain moments, *kairoi*, such as were 1610-20 in Lincolnshire and Leyden, and 1660-80 when Bunyan in prison, and Milton in blindness, and Richard Baxter in

the dock, saw and uttered heavenly things: such as was 1738-56 among the Methodist preachers and their people, and the 1830s and 40s among the humbly truculent Christian radicals. There is only one standing claim of the Free Churches: to have preached Christ and to have borne witness to Him, in life and in death. It is there, *Coram Deo*, that we shall join our brethren of the modern Church struggles, when our *kairos* comes, and where the children of God, who have been scattered abroad through the sin and folly of Christian men, may yet find one fold and one Shepherd.

GORDON RUPP.

The Fast Before Communion—II

ST AUGUSTINE has for long been a principal witness for the defence of fasting reception, in a canon of his synod at Hippo, and in the letter to Januarius. In the first he forbade priests to celebrate after dinner:

> "That the sacraments of the altar be not celebrated except *by fasting men* (*a jejunis hominibus*), the one yearly day being excepted when the Lord's Supper is celebrated (Maundy Thursday). If a memorial is to be offered for any dead person, whether for bishops or others, in the afternoon, it must be only with prayers, if those who do it have already *had dinner* (*si illi qui faciunt jam pransi inveniuntur*)."

Fasting, jejunus, is here equated with *non pransus,* not having taken the second, the midday meal; and the canon looks towards afternoon celebrations, which might otherwise be made sacrilegious through surfeiting. It is the first known conciliar attempt to establish abstinence immediately before Communion; it says nothing of no-breakfast, or of no-food-or-drink from the midnight before; and it is a canon of a local, not an œcumenical, council. It was not readily accepted; it was re-enacted at councils of Carthage twice in Augustine's lifetime. This is interesting in view of the literal interpretation sometimes given to the claim in the letter to Januarius, seven or eight years after the Hippo council, that receiving by fasting men was a custom "observed throughout the whole world." "Everybody does it" is often persuasive with someone who hitherto "does not"; and it would be hard to name a "universal" custom so elusive and without evidence as this, even in the fourth century.

The letter to Januarius is important; it was written in reply to questions about the Maundy Eucharist, put apparently by one who had travelled and seen things done differently from the way he was used to at home: ought there to be two celebrations on that day, one in the morning and one "again after supper"? or, if an evening one only, ought it to be before supper or after it? The meal in question is the *coena, supper,* no other. St Augustine replies that neither Scripture *nor a uniform custom in the Church throughout the world* gives a conclusive answer; customs vary, and "none of these is done against faith or morals." It is certainly clear that when the disciples

first received the body and blood of the Lord, they received not fasting, *non eos accepisse jejunos*. But must we on that account blame the whole Church, because the sacrament is always received by fasting men, *a jejunis*? "Nay, but for this reason, 'it seemed good to the Holy Ghost' [*i.e.*, in a relevant council, that of Hippo] that, in honour of so great a sacrament, the Lord's body should enter the mouth of a Christian *before other food* [*prius quam cæteri cibi*—that is, not after the meal, as in the Upper Room, but before it], for on that account this custom is observed throughout the whole world." [Which we have seen to be hyperbole, employing a common idiom of the time.] The Lord's giving the Communion after food does not oblige the brethren to receive the sacrament *after dinner or supper* [*pransi aut cœnati*, Fr Thurston omits this clause from his quotation, p. 10, thereby obscuring further the relation of this discussion with its context], or to mingle it with their tables. The Lord did not Himself teach the order in which it was to be taken, but left that to His Apostles to determine. St Paul "set this in order" when he came to Corinth after the first Epistle. Some entertain the laudable opinion, *probabilis ratio*, that on Maundy Thursday, for a more striking commemoration, the body and blood of the Lord might be offered and received after food. "But I think this were more decently [*honestius*] done at such an hour, that he who has kept the fast [*jejunaverit*—the Lenten fast] may come to the oblation *after the refection* which is customary at three o'clock [*post refectionem quæ hora nona fit, ad oblationem possit occurrere*—a definite recommendation of communion after food]. Wherefore we compel none to have dinner [*neminem cogimus prandere*] before that Lord's Supper [as some might compel, for a 'more striking commemoration'], but we dare forbid none." That is the substance of the letter, as Dearmer interprets it; its reference is to Maundy Thursday only. A section of it, removed from its context, was incorporated in the *Decretum*, and became a trump card on the fasting reception side. The latter part, recommending Communion after a refection, was either ignored or taken up with the simple alteration of *post refectionem* to *ante*. Fr Thurston might have been expected to submit Dearmer's interpretation to a drastic analysis; he is content, however, to quote Professor Cheetham that the passage in the *Decretum* is "conclusive as to the practice of that time," and then to assume support for that conclusion from the *silence* of conciliar decrees. We accept, therefore, Dearmer's conclusion, that St Augustine forbade his priests to celebrate in the afternoon after the *prandium*, and for a very good reason; that on Maundy Thursday he thought Communion after supper reasonable and good; that he could not forbid it after dinner, but preferred it after the light three o'clock refection which, for those who had kept it, ended the penitential fast.

This survey of the disputed evidences has gone far enough, and here it must be left. The question of authority, in so far as this can be historically determined, can be closed: baulked of a canon of a general council, the advocates of the rule of fasting reception still

claim a custom "so primitive and so universal" as to require no canonical enactment.[1] Even the slenderest knowledge of the subject matter of the canons makes so solemn an hypothesis appear remote and almost funny; a survey of the evidence makes it untenable. The curious may pursue Dearmer and Fr Thurston further if they will; Dearmer examining the decrees of local councils for the emergence of the rule, and Fr Thurston bringing forward others which Dearmer missed, and much besides, but without seriously shaking Dearmer's main contention. Anyone can see that Dearmer overdoes it at the end. He does well to quote the commentator on Gratian, c. 1250, that "the fast exists when digestion is complete" (p. 100); but to crown his argument with a chapter charging St Thomas Aquinas with making the fast "a rigid law for the first time" is to set on his work a pitiful bald crown; St Thomas did not make laws, he wrote books; and when he defined the Eucharistic fast as beginning at midnight he did so, not on any authority of his own, but of what was becoming a prescription in the Church. The early ascetic notion which we have seen emerging in the fourth century has developed; that it made an early appeal to some as a spiritual preparation for Communion we do not deny, and the evidence encourages us to believe that it did; but the crucial period of development is that from the sixth century to the twelfth, in the struggle with barbarous and uncouth manners even within the sanctuary and at the altar. Dearmer's contention that the discipline spread in order to assure sobriety at the altar moves Fr Thurston to expressions of pain; yet some of his own instances serve to confirm it, and he goes far towards admitting it in a footnote to p. 7. There are significant phrases, too, in the texts, which elude the eye in Fr Thurston's paraphrases—*e.g.*, in the section of the letter addressed by Nicholas I to the Bulgarians, mentioned on p. 4, *"quando gulæ deditus non invenitur jejunus"* (Migne, *P.L.*, 119, col. 1004); in Paschasius Radbertus, *"Verumtamen quod jejuni communicamus, satis provide fit, ut dum sobrietas flagrat in corpore, dum omnis fervor carnis quiescit, etc."* (*ib.*, 120, col. 1331). In the German penitential, of which Fr Thurston quotes question 144 (p. 11), question 143 runs thus: *"Fecisti quod quidam facere solent? post prandium vadunt ad missam, et ipsi saturi et vinolenti, a sacerdote pro populo offerente signum pacis accipere præsum unt? Si fecisti, tres dies in pane et aqua pœnitas"* (contrast no. 145, *ten* days on bread and water for gossiping at Mass under cover of the prayers); and in St Thomas Aquinas himself, the third of his reasons for the rule, *"propter periculum vomitus, et ebrietatis, etc."* All of these eluded Fr Thurston's pen. The second part of his pamphlet, on the superstitions

[1] Cp. a parish magazine, May, 1947: "The rule . . . has been the absolute law of the Catholic Church everywhere from the very earliest times. So, for example, we find St Augustine saying, 'It pleased the Holy Ghost,' etc. The rule comes to us, then, with the fullest authority of the Church, which is the Body of Christ, inspired and indwelt by the Holy Ghost. When the Church in this way speaks with an authoritative and unanimous voice she is, as the Body of Christ, incapable of error and to be disobeyed only under pain of mortal sin."

surrounding the holy-bread (*eulogiæ, pain bénit*) distributed after Mass and before food "for housel against the fiends," is interesting but beside the point: Anglicans interest themselves in the more corrupt practices of the Middle Ages for diversion or historical pursuit; for their canonical authorities they are wont to look elsewhere.

Nor can the pleas be sustained that the Church of England carried over the prescription from the Middle Ages, so establishing it among us *as a law*. No such prescription could be upheld in face of first, the radical and revolutionary changes in Eucharistic teaching, discipline, and practice intended by the Reformers, and secondly, the silence of the formularies at the very points where both fasting and the necessary preparation for Communion are most carefully defined. The Homily *Of Fasting* asserts, as a propostion to be proved in the Second Part,

> "that no constitution or law made by man, for things which of their own proper nature be mere indifferent, can bind the conscience of Christian men to a perpetual observation and keeping thereof; but that the higher powers hath full liberty to alter and change every such law and ordinance, either ecclesiastical or political, when time and place shall require."

It teaches fasting as a spiritual and civil duty; nowhere does it mention fasting reception. The canons and injunctions of the period are likewise silent. The rules of fasting, or abstinence, added to the Prayer Book in 1661 had been observed long enough before the Reformation to have stood upon prescription, without this new canonical and statutory sanction, added probably to restore the discipline decayed during the Commonwealth. Fasting reception, for which an older, "immemorial," prescription is claimed, is not among them; either therefore it was not counted as a law before the decay, or, if it had been, its revival was not desiderated. Preparation for Communion is treated at length in the Exhortations in the Order of Communion dating from 1548, rubrically at the beginning of the service since 1549, summarily in the part of the Catechism enacted in 1604; nowhere is this fast enjoined. True it is that a succession of the worthiest divines can be traced, commending the discipline, some of them indeed as if it had the force of law; but none of these private judgments can give it the force of law; nor did those whose example lent most weight to the revival in the nineteenth century ever attempt to impose their personal self-discipline upon others as a law. In fine, the position to which we are driven was admirably stated by Bishop Mandell Creighton in debating a Report on this subject in the Upper House of Canterbury Convocation in 1893:

> "It would be an entire limitation of the practical power of the Church of England, as an independent branch of the Catholic Church, if we were to suppose or admit for a moment that the practice of the Church since the sixteenth century did not in itself establish an abrogation of custom which before that time had been in use. The real argument of those who maintain the view from which we dissent is an attempt to tie round us principles and usages of particular churches in times of antiquity; and because they have not been by any formal decision of the Church of England abrogated, to suppose that they are still binding. I think it may be pointed out—and it would apply to many points which are pressed at the present day—that the

> fact of the existence of a usage in the African Church in the fourth century, however valuable that usage may be in itself, and however explicable by reference to the exact circumstances of the life and times in which it prevailed, did not form a binding rule upon the Church of England, either in the sixteenth or, and still less, in the nineteenth century. (At the Reformation) the necessary conditions for a faithful reception were defined; but no special mode of securing those conditions was imposed as obligatory. The contention from which we dissent appears to make the physical condition of the recipient more important than his moral and spiritual condition. . . ." (*Chronicle of Convocation*, 1893, pp. 271 f.)

And on that statement we could not, if we would, improve.

It is greatly to the credit of the Church of Rome that, having this law of a total fast from midnight (Can. 808 of the *Codex* for the celebrant, Can. 858 for the communicant), she has responded to the demands of the faithful in war-time, and of the apostolate to a newly pagan Europe after it, with realistic dispensations grounded, not in expediency alone, but in a new historical and theological approach to the whole relation of liturgy and discipline to society. An Anglican concerning himself with the Eucharistic fast ought now to begin his study with neither Dearmer nor Thurston, nor with any of the products of a century of insular controversy, but with two articles on the recent papal indults—*Jeûne eucharistique et indults récents en France*, by A. Delchard, S.J., in *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, fevrier 1948 (Louvain); and *Jeûne Eucharistique et heure de la Messe*, by D. A. Robeyns, in *Les Questions Liturgiques et Paroissiales*, jan-juin 1948 (Louvain). Dispensations from the fast are not new—J. Wickham Legg published a review of some, beginning with that granted to the Old Pretender in 1756, in *Papal Faculties Allowing Food before Communion* (S.P.C.K. for C.H.S., 1905). Since 1906 there has been a steady relaxation of the law on behalf of the sick and infirm, and, since 1923, for priests in defined circumstances duplicating or celebrating in the afternoon. But the last war brought an extended relaxation all over Europe, in Central Europe more liberally than in France and the West. The claims of men in the firing line, in prison or internment or labour camps, and in civil defence; of chaplains with the armies and in camps and hospitals; of civilians mobilized for war, and living in cities nightly at the "alert" and under bombardment or the threat of it—all these were met by indults issued to diocesan bishops individually, authorizing them to grant various dispensations to persons in various categories within their jurisdictions. There was a consequent diversity in these indults which may be studied to advantage in the tables in Dom Robeyn's article. In general, they permitted celebration or Communion within periods of four hours to one hour after taking solid food, and one hour after medicine or liquid food, and in some cases without a fast at all; and the same relaxation is given to the priest-celebrant as to the communicant in similar circumstances.

The value of such dispensations to the Church in war-threatened cities, and the sense of loss when, after the war, the indults were

limited or withdrawn, are illustrated by a parish priest of Trèves in an article in *Les Questions Liturgiques et Paroissiales*, juillet-dec 1947, p. 157 f. Evening masses were habitual in the eighteen churches of the city; they were celebrated at the time found by experience to be least visited by the nightly "alert," within one hour each side of nightfall; and by choosing the time when the local shops and offices were closing the clergy drew congregations so large and regular that courses of sermons and instructions became possible. The fast was reduced, first to four hours, then to two; from some it was not in practice required at all. After the war much of this was reluctantly given up, except an evening Mass on Sundays and festivals in four centrally placed churches, to which communicants came prepared by a fast of two hours from food and of one hour from drink. But to the many who, fatigued and undernourished, still communicated without fasting at the late morning Mass, most priests turned a blind or indulgent eye.

On October 23, 1947, the variety of particular indults was replaced for a year by two general indults for the whole of France, obtained from the Holy See by the bishops supplicating through the Cardinal-Archbishop of Paris. The first recites the debility of clergy and people after the strain of war, the shortage of the clergy, and the desire of the faithful for more frequent communion. Repealing cc. 808 and 858, §1, it concedes, to celebrant and communicants alike, the liberty to take non-alcoholic liquid food up to one hour before a Mass celebrated or Communion received after 9 a.m., and the same for a Mass or Communion before 9 a.m. if they have to go a long distance to the nearest church (not the church of their choice) or engage in heavy work before going. The official interpretation published in the Diocese of Paris applies the indult to any day in the year except Good Friday; it defines the long distance as $1\frac{1}{2}$ km., and the heavy work as the ordinary occupations of industrial or agricultural society and the maternal care of the home. The ablutions taken at a first mass, although alcoholic, come within the permission of the indult.

The second indult was also a product of the experience of the war. It relaxes Can. 821, §1, which restricts the celebration of Mass to between one hour before sunrise and one hour after midday; it authorizes the bishops of France to allow their priests to celebrate, on Sundays and Holy Days of obligation only, a second or a third Mass in the evening, whenever pressure of ministerial work or length of distances makes it impossible for them to celebrate twice or thrice before 1 p.m., and provided that they have kept a fast of three hours from solid food and of one hour from liquid or medicinal food. Further, they may permit evening Masses, on Sundays and Holy Days of obligation, where a large number of workers or public officials are kept from Mass in the morning by their work, and allow the faithful to communicate at them, both priest and people keeping the same fast as before, with alcohol altogether excluded.

These indults concede less than the bishops thought might reason-

ably be asked for, but they go some distance to meet the demands of the evangelistic work described, for instance, by Miss Maisie Ward in *France Pagan?* (Sheed and Ward, 1949, cp. *The Christian News-Letter*, No. 337, May 11, 1949). The theory underlying them is expounded brilliantly by Dom Robeyns in the article noticed above. His exposure of the separation of the sacramental and supernatural life of the Church from the lives of the masses in contemporary society is applicable to England as well as to France. Economic society demands men's time, it exhausts them in its service; either the Church may, with nostalgic moan, leave its services at the now traditional hours and continue a ministry to the leisured, the elderly, and the under-twelves, or it may return to its early adaptability and fix the times and discipline of its synaxes, as anciently they were fixed, with reference to men's liberty to come to them.

> "Il fallait porter le christianisme aux hommes: *sacramenta propter homines*. Il fallait donc d'abord atteindre ces hommes. Il fallait pouvoir les rassembler. D'instinct et sans discussion préalable sur les éléments d'une mystique du dimanche, les apôtres se sont *adaptés*. Ils ont convoqués les fidèles à l'heure où c'était possible. Nous voici donc après vingt siècles exactement devant le même problème, rendu apparement plus difficile parce que des usages bien établis entravent notre liberté d'action, sinon de pensé" (p. 75).
>
> "En tout cas, le culte, communautaire et paroissial par définition, est en fait réservé, de par la force des choses, à quelques catégories de chrétiens privilégiés et se déroule hors d'atteinte de la paroisse vivante (ou morte). Il donne à la masse l'impression que ces privilégiés constituent une espèce de capitalistes au spirituel" (p. 76).

In the first age, economics determined the time of the synaxis—when people were free from their work to come (mystical and allegorical reasons were found for it later); in the second age, it was the penitential fast—Communion was itself a breaking of the fast; therefore it might not come until the fast might be allowed to end; and in the third, it was the private Mass and its multiplication; though not till the end of the Middle Ages was Mass confined to the morning by constitution. Only in the first period, then, was the Church uninhibited in this liturgical ministry, and to the model of the first period we are now driven again. There is, in fact, no hour of the day or night at which the Catholic Church has not at some period met for its public liturgy.

At this point Dom Robeyns quotes with entire approval an article by the Rev. A. I. Sandford in the *Catholic Daily News*, October 6, 1913, entitled "Why not Mass in the Evening?" It was a prophetic plea for the synaxis at the time when men are free to gather, and when they gather naturally, the evening; and for communion for them after a fast of only two hours.

> "La question de l'heure de la messe entraine nécessairement celle du jeûne eucharistique. Ici encore, la discipline actuelle ne doit pas être considérée comme un 'ne varietur.' Elle doit être appréciée selon les nécessités religieuses et l'objectivité historique. Or, le jeûne eucharistique, quoique très ancien et vénérable n'est ni primitif, ni essentiel. A-t-il été institué surtout pour enrayer les abus découlant des repas eucharistiques? ou par respect

pour le sacrement? Les moralistes semblent le dire. Même dans ce cas, dès que le respect est sauvegardé, aucune antinomie n'existe entre une nourriture matérielle et le sacrement qui a été institué au cours d'un repas et 'per modum cibi' " (pp. 84 f.).

This is just the conclusion the English bishops came to in their Convocation of Canterbury in 1893, which Dearmer meant to affirm, in his own odd way, and which we uphold.

The Church of England is neither bound nor loosed by modern papal legislation. Yet she may properly (and will, if she is wise) study the experiments in evangelism being made in Roman Catholic countries and learn something for herself. She is not, in this matter of the Eucharistic fast, bound by law or canonical prescription at all; yet she is closely bound by habits of mind, and dislike of too much change, and, at her best, by some fairly thorough concepts of natural fitness. As things are now, evening communions are generally out of favour, largely because they are practised (with conspicuous exceptions) where they need not be. Yet if the Church of England is to evangelize, and if in the study of her strategy she is led to conclusions like those now being hammered out in France, and tries (being ready to pay the price) to meet men with Liturgy and the Sacraments when and where they naturally gather, she will need to re-examine her customs, her pieties, and the standards of propriety on which she rests, and find perhaps in the nakedly primitive an Apostleship which is new.

G. R. Dunstan.

(*Concluded*)

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Right Rev. Eric Graham has been Bishop of Brechin since 1944.

The Rev. Gordon Rupp is Tutor, Richmond College, Surrey.

The Rev. G. R. Dunstan is Vicar of Sutton Courtenay, Berks.

CORRESPONDENCE

ORDINANDS' EXAMINATIONS

To the Editor of Theology.

Sir,

In the article you published in December, "An Ordinand" has raised some serious and interesting questions about the General Ordination Examination. As one who has been concerned with the conduct of the examination since it was reorganized in 1946, I should like to offer some comments on the points to which the author objects, as these are summarized at the end of his article.

1. *Re-examination in individual papers in which the examiners have previously been satisfied.*

I am not sure that the author has understood the rule, which is that if a man takes four or more papers (but fewer than eight) he may fail and be "referred" in one of them, provided that on the *remaining papers* his total marks reach a certain aggregate, and again if he takes eight or more in a group he may be "referred" in two papers with a similar proviso about an aggregate on the remaining papers. The necessary aggregate is so calculated as to ensure that a man has on at least three papers in a group gained an average mark which is a clear pass (five out of ten) as opposed to a weak pass (four). To put the point generally, when a man fails in one paper but has done reasonably well in at least three of the rest he is not required to take any of the rest again. The rule is clearly a corollary of the group system to which the author objects. (See the next point.) If a man could take four papers, pass in one only and be credited with that one, the group system would be negated.

2. *The present practice of taking the papers in groups of four.*

The rule is that the fourteen papers (for those taking the full examination) "may be taken in two or three groups, provided that not fewer than four papers are taken in each group." "An Ordinand" argues that since this is a pass examination it might be taken in smaller sections, and he suggests that two papers might be taken at the beginning of each term after one term's work on those two subjects, thus easing the burden on the memory of the candidate and increasing concentration. I see some practical objections. Four examinations a year would be necessary; it is difficult enough to organize the present three. The examiners are nearly all busy men, and even if under the proposed scheme the total number of scripts to mark at each examination would be fewer than at present, it is practically certain that all the papers would have to be set every time, since it would be a miracle if all the Theological Colleges agreed to teach the same two subjects in the same terms. There is also in my opinion a more serious objection of principle to the plan proposed. It is surely better educationally to spend two terms at four or five subjects than one term at two, which would be rapid cramming with a vengeance. The present rule is partly designed to prevent this. Understanding of a subject as opposed to mere memorizing needs a certain length of time to develop. The present group system attempts to secure this as far as is practicable within the total time available for the course. Teachers and examiners alike wish that this could be three rather than the present normal two years, but this ideal is unlikely to be reached for a long time yet. A man can now, for instance, enter his college in July, take five papers the next March (eight to nine months), four papers in the following August-September (five months), and the remaining five in the following March (six months). This seems to be a reasonable rhythm, with some terms (including the last, before ordination at Trinity) entirely free from examinations. One can sympathize with those who find the examination a burden, while observing that the percentage of failures is not such as to show that it is beyond the capacity of the great majority of candidates to pass the examination

in a normal time. It may be added that at the revision of the syllabus in 1946 the work in worship and ethics was considerably reduced, and permission was given to offer the papers in three groups, whereas previously only two were allowed.

3. *The number of questions in a paper which a candidate is required to answer.*

"An Ordinand" is evidently an Oxford man, and I have sympathy with his objection. But I understand that at Cambridge five or six answers are normally required in the Theological Tripos papers. Our experience in G.O.E. is that it is a help to many candidates if a specific number of answers is required without an alternative, and this being so, the number five suits the majority of candidates better than the number four. The examination has to cater for men with a widely differing range of experience (or lack of it) in examinations. It is doubtful whether any but the Oxford honours man suffer in this matter of the number of answers required, and I think well enough of him to believe that (perhaps with a slight shrug of the shoulders) he can adapt himself to this requirement, as in fact he usually does.

4. *Re-examination in all eight biblical papers for a man who has a "third"* (i.e., in certain specified honours examinations in theology).

In rules concerning the exemption from one examination by other examinations there can hardly fail to be some element of arbitrariness. Standards in honours examinations differ. It seems to be a sound general principle that any exemption is a privilege to be won only by reaching a high standard in the exempting examination, and the requirement of first- or second-class honours for exemption from the biblical papers in G.O.E. is a way of asserting this principle. The suggestion that marks of individual papers in degree examinations should be taken into account would not in my opinion work. Oxford examiners, for example, could not be compelled even by the Faculty to give the marks or to allow them to be divulged officially to a non-University body. In one year the examiners might consent and in another year they might refuse. The risk of staleness in the third-class man, who has to do his Bible work over again, is no doubt a real one, but if he has in fact reached G.O.E. standard already he should be capable of passing at least the general O.T. and N.T. papers after one term at his Theological College, having also had time to begin work on some new subject.

5. *The scope of the paper on Christian Ethics.*

At present the scope of this paper is explicitly introductory; it is presupposed that study of the subject will be continued after ordination. It would clearly be possible, as "An Ordinand" suggests, to confine the paper to New Testament Ethics. But it is fair to suppose that candidates will have covered this part of the subject to some extent in their general study of the N.T. Accordingly the paper has two parts, the first concerned with "an introductory survey of the nature and validity of the moral judgment," and the second with New Testament Ethics. I can only say that in practice this arrangement of the paper yields results which do not provide any strong

case for a change. "An Ordinand" thinks that the reading of books on psychology should not be delayed until after ordination. There is nothing in the G.O.E. syllabus to suggest such a delay, and there are always questions in the paper to which a knowledge of psychology is relevant. So far as the *demands* of this paper go it is a matter of putting them high enough to ensure that something useful is done, but not so high as to carry the subject beyond an introductory stage. Reading and teaching can go as far beyond what is demanded as time and capacity permit.

In general, I think it is inevitable that any examination devised for such a variety of candidates as is G.O.E. should contain features which are irksome or burdensome to some. The able man and the weak man alike will, for instance, dislike the width of the syllabus, though for different reasons. This fact does not, however, make thoughtful criticism, such as that of "An Ordinand," any less useful, and if it were found that his views were shared by responsible teachers in the Colleges, consideration of them would have to be carried much further than has been possible in this letter.

Yours sincerely,
H. J. Carpenter.

Keble College.
Oxford.

BOOK REVIEWS

Calvin's Doctrine of Man. By T. F. Torrance. Lutterworth Press. 14s.

This book has a significance, apart from its intrinsic value, which should not be overlooked. It is the first monograph on a particular doctrine of Calvin to appear in England during this half-century. There have been, it is true, two books on his theology in general, but these are more in the way of general introductions. Now at last a whole book has been devoted to the serious and careful examination of a part of Calvin's theology. In other words, British theologians are at last beginning to wrestle with his thought. The result can only be the stimulation and enrichment of our national theology.

Some who come to read the book will be very surprised to find a Calvin strange to English minds; not the rabid and joyless Protestant for ever harping on predestination and damnation that their church-history books have made him out to be, but a great Catholic theologian. Dr Torrance has given us the true Calvin, the Calvin we find in the *Institutio*, the *Commentaries*, and the *Sermons*. This is a comprehensive and accurate presentation of the Reformer's thought, and in it we see that he is speaking the authentic language of the Church, and yet speaking it creatively as well as traditionally.

Creatively chiefly in this respect, that he perceives very clearly that man must not be considered merely in relationship to himself or to his world or to his creature "god," but in his relationship to

the Blessed Trinity, to the Father who made him, to the Son who redeemed him, and to the Holy Ghost who sanctifies him. This means, in effect, that he must be considered from the point of view of the grace of God; so that it is only in the context of grace that we can formulate a doctrine of man—as creature, as the subject of the knowledge of God, even as sinner. In the thoroughness with which Calvin grasps and works out this Scriptural conception of the nature of man, he shows himself in this respect also to be a theologian "second to none in the history of the Christian Church." True, he sometimes is inconsistent, sometimes apparently self-contradictory (as in the matter of total corruption and the remnant of the *imago dei*—as Dr Torrance says pithily: "If one is forced to speak about a remnant of the image of God, surely it can no longer image God's glory," pp. 93-4). In such cases we must appeal, as Dr Torrance does, from Calvin ill-informed to Calvin better-informed.

This exposition of Calvin's doctrine of man—taking us through man's self-knowledge, his place in the creation, the *imago dei*, total perversity, the sin of the mind, the knowledge of God, and natural theology—is learned and profound. Although the author deliberately quotes no other theologians nor mentions previous writers on Calvin, the range of his theological learning and particularly of his knowledge of Calvin-studies is everywhere apparent. The book is therefore accurate "history of doctrines," and will without doubt be the authoritative work on the subject for a very long time. As for profundity, we will quote one passage that shows Dr Torrance's appreciation of the prophetic quality of Calvin's concept of man: "It is in this community of man with God and man with man that we have been created to image the glory of the Godhead. In other words, it is as believers are bound together in the mutual relations of the Body of Christ, so that, while many, they are one in the perfect Man, that through the Spirit of unity and love and Truth they image the unity of the Father and the Son" (p. 45).

T. H. L. Parker.

Brothertoft.

An Outline of New Testament Ethics. By Lindsay Dewar. Hodder and Stoughton. 8s. 6d.

Morality and God. By E. W. Hirst. Epworth Press. 6s.

An echo of a more modest claim in the author's preface is found on the dust-cover of *New Testament Ethics*. "It will thus be invaluable . . . to all Christians who desire to understand . . . the moral teaching which they profess." Yet the word "hedonistic" from the book's third sentence meant nothing at all last Sunday to the fifty or sixty members of an adult (mixed) Bible class near here. A wide intellectual gap too often separates the theologian from the public he would address.

"Clergymen, ministers, and theological students," to whom also the book is addressed, may themselves find it weighted with an in-

tellectual bias. Four qualities, for example, are selected as particularly condemned by our Lord. The emphasis on "porneia," which is put first, is valuable—especially as some Christian apologists would escape its challenge by deprecating the total importance of sex. Next comes "pleonexia," its connexion with idolatry ably revealed. The third, hypocrisy, is convincingly identified with lack of consistency. But it is further defined as "mental dishonesty—unwillingness to think things out"—in fact, a vice of the intellect. The fourth, "aphrosune," becomes "any kind of intellectual failing which has a moral root." Christianity is "a revealed religion and therefore a dogmatic system of beliefs." Even thus, have theologians from the second century considered the guidance of the Holy Spirit into all truth as primarily a gift to the intellect?

Yet Canon Dewar is careful to emphasize that such guidance is essential in the interlocking spheres of faith and morality. He illustrates this main theme, the ethic of the Holy Spirit, based on the imitation of Christ, by many valuable biblical "connexions." The Good Samaritan is connected with Dives and Lazarus; "Blessed are the peacemakers" with the triumphal entry of the Prince of Peace; 1 Cor. xiii with 1 Peter iii, 8 f.; and both, together with the account of the heavenly wisdom in James (iii, 17), with the character of Christ. Agape is finely treated, especially in the recognition that "liking" is integral to it.

Occasionally, however, readers may find the treatment of the "New Testament" less masterly than that of the "Ethics." We read, apparently on the evidence of John vii, 22, that circumcision owes its place in Judaism to the priestly school. The dubious connexion between Jewish proselyte and Christian baptism is cheerfully assumed. More serious is the "fact that Luke has substituted 'poor' for 'poor in spirit' " in the Beatitudes. After this, evangelical poverty need hardly be considered. Thus on Matt. v, 40 ("let him have thy cloke also"): "It is plainly absurd to suppose that our Lord is suggesting that we should give all our clothes away!" Yet that is precisely what St Francis did do; in court, too, and at the beginning of his peerless embodiment of the New Testament Ethic at that.

"Clergy, ministers, and theological students," especially the latter, may also read *Morality and God* with profit. Here again the main theme that morality is theological, that the Good is Personal Love, is evoked by the separation of morals from faith in contemporary society. You will find the necessary historical introduction. You may discover in the "unipersonal" and "interpersonal" of this philosophical essay the more familiar "I-it" and "I-thou." For you the essay's conclusions will be the right answers. It is short, and what it says is important and true. But how far is its presentation original?

A. H. Dammers.

Anderton,
Chorley.

THE CRISIS OF THE HUMAN PERSON. By J. B. Coates. Longmans. 12s. 6d.

This book is about Personalism. The opening and closing chapters expound and discuss the doctrine in general, and the particular position of the author, the founder of the London Personalist Group. The middle of the book summarizes contemporary answers to "the crisis of the human person" by Berdyaev, Buber, Mumford, and J. Middleton Murry ("Personalists"), Mannheim, Laski, Burnham, Heard, Aldous Huxley, Koestler, Read, C. S. Lewis, and Reich. These summaries are well done; the book is valuable for them alone. Personalism describes any philosophy which insists, in opposition to both collectivism and individualism, upon the uniqueness and spiritual values of the human personality, realized and developed in community. As the name of a contemporary movement, Personalism appears to be a response to the challenge of totalitarianism, especially among moderately left-wing intellectuals who are emancipated from the fetters of Christian orthodoxy. For them it offers "a positive faith and a constructive philosophy" (p. 10). The chief source books are by Berdyaev and Buber. The immediate inspiration is Mounier's work abroad through the journal *Esprit*. But the London Group is evidently more critical of Marxism, and in a typically English fashion is seeking a *via media* between existentialism (for which the world is *de trop*) and all the variants of scientism and materialism.

I think the Personalists have a good claim upon our interest and sympathy: no doubt they will swear at the unintended "superiority" of this remark! They are indeed fellow-travellers, "prepared to work with all persons and organizations going in the right direction" (p. 32), but very suspicious of the "ossified," "legalistic," and "authoritarian" characteristics of the traditional Churchianity of their natural allies (and have we no Pharisaic skeletons in our cupboards?). Mr Coates himself is a theist who has seen through the emerging God of the evolutionary pantheists, the projected God of certain psychologists, and the unnecessary God of agnostic-mystics like Olaf Stapledon (p. 237 f.). What is needed next? (1) A dose of sober Niebuhrian realism about the blindness and selfishness in the heart of man. Do the Personalists *really* believe that the way out of our troubles is a cheap edition of Buber's *I-Thou* by Gollancz (p. 80), and broadcast discussions between Communists and Democrats, Buddhists and Catholics (p. 32 f.)? Evidently optimistic rationalism is dead, but it won't lie down. (2) A critique of the modern-gnostic heresy that the transcendent and eternal cannot interpenetrate the temporal and material and remain itself: to canalize the Spirit is to fossilize it or imprison it. Hence, real relationships between persons, or of persons with God, cannot be subjected to the control of external forms or disciplines: marriages cannot be sealed in heaven by ceremonies (pp. 219, 225); sacraments are "inconsistent with the inwardness of spiritual experience" (p. 212). On the other hand, though moral laws are never simply the product of social necessities, they share their relative changing character (p. 29 f.).

For the growing crowd of fellow-travellers, typified by the Personalists, who are rightly reacting from the poverty of materialism and the "scientific attitude," the stone of stumbling is still the Incarnation and all that it implies.

Basil S. Moss.

Lincoln Theological College
(Scholæ Cancellarii).

The Middle Ages in the West. A study of European unity. By Sir Henry Slesser. Hutchinson. 21s.

A book written to sustain a thesis possesses advantages and disadvantages easily to be discerned: advantages since, if the purpose be kept in view, the thread ought to be visible winding its way hither and thither, even if the course be tortuous, amid the rocks and boulders and ravines and meadows, the sandy wastes and muddy flats; disadvantages since even the most heroic efforts will not always succeed in convincing an external observer that what emerges at the end is really the same as what derived from the hypothetical source to which attention was drawn at the outset. The present work by an author who by implication has convinced himself that at the Reformation England "abandoned the Catholic faith" (p. 222) seeks to re-tell the story of the Middle Ages in such a way as to suggest that in the good or bad or variegated old days Europe had a "homogeneous culture, which outside the Catholic Church has never been repaired," with the implication that there at least all is well. "Medieval men possessed a common spiritual and idealistic principle which to-day is very lacking . . . besides [*sic*] modern incompatibilities the conflicts of Guelph and Ghibbeline [*sic*] sovereigns appear to be mere differences of administrative power. The future will decide whether the material necessity of union or the possession of a common Catholic morality and metaphysic is the more compulsive and enduring."

The narrative is divided into two parts: I—"The History," with eight chapters devoted to Origins, the Uncertain Dawn, the Revival, the Church Militant, Cities and Universities, the Rise of Monarchy, Papal Europe, Disintegration; II—"Failure and Achievement," with four sections dealing with Government and Law, Commerce, Science and the Arts, Medieval Philosophy, and the Defence of the Faith. One cannot do everything in 252 pages, and it may seem therefore hardly fair to complain that an overcrowded canvas, an allusive style, a complete absence of references to original authorities, and even to pages of modern writers whose works are quoted, will make a reader's task unduly arduous. A careful reader is not likely to be misled by references on two successive pages to a "stagivite" and to "John Damascene of Poitiers," and one who is willing to take a great deal of trouble will reasonably hope to learn not a little from his exertions including the unravelling of the puzzle of Maurus, Raban, and Rhaban Maur as he finds them in text and index, and doing justice to the Countess Matilda who,

in spite of numerous allusions in the text, finds no place in the index. He will find matter of interest also in the chapter on "Cities and Universities," including Bologna and its "principle [*sic*] faculty, that of law" and Paris, where "the fact that it was the capital would appeal to the Sovereign; the insistence on theology as the principle [*sic*] teaching, to the Pope," and in the account of Magna Carta: "The Charter was nothing really new, save only that the citizens of London, or at least the principle [*sic*] ones, as well as the Bishops and Lords, claimed liberties," and of the principle [*sic*] contribution of Augustine in the section on Government and Law. Authors and readers may well sigh for the olden days when the "printer's reader," often ill-paid and sometimes exasperating, proved to so many a friend beyond price in matters of spelling and punctuation.

There is nearly always something to be gained from studying a work which has given pleasure in the making as this has clearly done. There are two topics dear to the writer's heart: the one is culture and the other philosophy. Neither is perhaps easily patient of precise definition. "See here, Aaron," said a transatlantic mother in the reviewer's hearing as she endeavoured to tear a lad of fifteen away from a bookshop in the Turl: "See here, Aaron, I brought you to Europe to get culture, not to buy books." There are passages which might afford an amusing commentary on the dictum, and probably the emphasis would not be laid by everyone on the same particulars or areas or periods as the author has chosen for note. But there are two chapters in his second part of greater finish and elaboration than the rest of the book in which, especially in dealing with Aquinas and his relation to Plato and Aristotle and Augustine, he manages without ceasing entirely to be polemical to kindle warmer feelings of interest.

Claude Jenkins.

Christ Church,
Oxford.

The Church in Wales. Report of the Nation and Prayer Book Commission. Representative Body of the Church in Wales. 1s.

The Church in Wales is perhaps the most compact and united member of the great Anglican family of churches. Because of this it has been able to indulge in a form of ecclesiastical psycho-analysis without having to worry over strains caused by suppressed and unsuppressed party conflict and by the neurotic effects of a deep-rooted Erastian subconscious. This Report might be regarded as the psycho-analyst's findings, and within its limits it is a vigorous and stimulating piece of work. The first section, dealing with theological interest and study, castigates the Church in Wales for its indifference to intellectual life. Various practical measures are suggested for dealing with this state of affairs, but the section suffers from a perhaps understandable desire to mention distinctions and problems created by denominational differences in the principality.

The second section, dealing with the relation between the Church

and the Welsh nation, is full of good things. Again the Church is on the carpet for standing aloof from national life, and a strong case is made out for a reorientation of attitude in this matter. At the same time the problem is oversimplified. The compilers of the Report seem to look at the rising national consciousness of Wales with approving and rather uncritical eyes at any rate on the cultural level. (The political aspects of a revived nationalism are not discussed.) No attempt is made to ask how far this revival of national culture is being pushed upon the nation from above by a group of active intellectuals and educational administrators, and how far it is the expression of a new appreciation of their national heritage by the majority of the people. The truth is that in some areas it is the second of these things, but in some it undoubtedly is the first. The Church in Wales has the double responsibility of winning those who are in sympathy with this rebirth of national culture and also of providing for those who are not in the least interested in it. The Report shows no appreciation of this problem.

The third part of the Report, dealing with the need for liturgical reform, is excellent. For Wales this is a double problem; the Prayer Book in Welsh has to be considered as well as the English Book of Common Prayer. The Constitutional position is carefully explained, and other provincial reforms of the Prayer Book are analyzed in a useful appendix. On this matter one sentence in the Report expresses a truth of first importance: "We are convinced that it would be no service to the Church at present to propose schemes of revision which could be justified on grounds of liturgical scholarship, but would not command general agreement because they are in advance of the general opinion of the Church."

J. H. Jacques.

South Witham,
Lincs.

SHORTER NOTICES

Ablaze yet not Consumed. The Reformation and the Presbyterian Church. By D. Johnston Martin. Lutterworth Press. 7s. 6d.

This book has two aims—first, to provide an account of the Presbyterian Church and its principles; and secondly, to make a contribution from the Free Church side to the discussion on orders and catholicity.

The first aim is admirably achieved in a brief but well-written account of the Reformation on the Continent and Europe, with good pen-portraits of Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, and Knox. The book might well be recommended to those requiring a brief introduction to the history of the Reformation. There is also an interesting chapter on English Presbyterianism. There are places where the author's accuracy is open to question: Did Zwingli always hold mere memorialist views of the Eucharist (p. 61)? Is it correct to describe Bucer as "a true Presbyterian" (p. 88)? Were the contacts

with the Reformed Churches abroad repudiated by the Anglican Church soon after the Reformation (p. 113)?

In its second and wider aim there is something of value too. It is good to be reminded that Calvin, Knox, and the Westminster Confession all advocated weekly Communion, and it is right that we should be reminded that the Presbyterians hold that their one ordained order is that of the bishop "who is ordained and consecrated in one act" (p. 187), and therefore can ordain and confirm others. Dr Martin maintains that John Wesley should have turned Presbyterian when he reached the same conclusion. Anglicans will find irritating certain asides which may have amused the Presbyterian audience who heard the substance of the book as lectures, such as the remark about the Church of England being "saddled with Cranmer's liturgy" (p. 147), but they should heed his warning against the propaganda often directed against Calvin. The suggestion that theological students should be taught the principles of other denominations by members of those denominations is interesting and useful.

Michael Hennell.

Ridley Hall,
Cambridge.

The Baptism and Temptation of Christ. By Frank Buchanan. J. Clarke. 6s.

This is a daring essay on the theological significance of water from Genesis to the Fourth Gospel—the Creation, Noah, Elijah, Daniel, the Baptist, our Lord. Although the harmony of Paradise was disrupted and strife turned the garden into a wilderness, God gave mankind, in Noah, a promise of recreation. And throughout the Old Testament Israel struggles to give birth to this promise, but her history is the record of her failure. This becomes explicit when the historical documents become trustworthy; but in the early part of the Old Testament the promise of the myth that there would be a new man is in danger of being fulfilled by each of the remarkable births narrated. These accounts, however, being in fact unhistorical, serve only to point us forward, until at last in our Lord's baptism in Jordan Israel's frustration is gathered up into her hope and the historical fact is one with the myth. The waters of the baptism open the way from the wilderness to the Promised Land.

In the second part of his book Mr Buchanan argues that the devil tempted the Lord to tear the myth and the fact asunder. First, let Him transform the wilderness into a garden of plenty by a liberal use of His divine powers (*i.e.*, He was to revert to Israel's frustrated effort to fulfil the hope by means only of the flesh). Secondly, let Him be the sort of Messiah that the people wanted (*i.e.*, vindicate the hope of Israel by abolishing its frustration). Thirdly, He is tempted to win the world by worldly means (*i.e.*, to adopt the very way by which the hope of Israel had been frustrated in the past instead of Himself bearing the burden of the wilderness). The

temptations are rejected. So we are told that after the Resurrection the disciples feed on bread from a land which was once a wilderness. "The work of man's salvation is now accomplished; the wilderness of the world's sin is now a garden of remembrance."

Part of this book originally appeared as articles in *The Presbyter*, and it is now easier to see where Mr Buchanan is leading us than we could in the discontinuity of quarterly articles. He is plainly indebted to Sir Edwyn Hoskyns, but there are only two references in the text to any authorities for his statements, and the work is a stimulating original piece of biblical exegesis which everyone can afford to buy.

WILFRID BROWNING.

HOVE.

LANDMARKS IN THE STORY OF CHRISTIANITY. By H. A. Guy. Macmillan. 6s.

Mr Guy has written a useful survey of Christian history. His title implies selectivity and, as the book is mainly intended for the "middle forms of secondary schools," the emphasis is placed, perhaps wisely, on personalities rather than movements. The style is simple, clear, and attractive; the maps are well drawn. But it is questionable whether the book is well proportioned. Of the one hundred and sixty pages the first fifteen supply a succinct account of the life and work of Jesus Christ. The next thirty or so pages cover the growth of the Christian Church; the relations between the Church and the Roman State and the significance of the conversion of Constantine. Mr Guy does not mention the heretical movements, which in their intricate detail might well bore the readers whom he has in mind, but to omit all reference to the controversies which split Christendom, and as a result of which the body of Christian doctrine emerged, may tend to distort the reader's understanding of the history of the early Church. The next chapter is entitled The Church in the Middle Ages (by which Mr Guy really means what is generally called the Dark Ages), and together with the two following sections entitled the Rise of Islam and Lights in the Dark Ages, covering thirty-six pages, it deals with Christian history between 500 and 1500. The result, it must be confessed, is distinctly unsatisfactory. To think of medieval civilization in terms of St Francis, Raymon Lull, and John Wyclif is surely to create a misleading impression; what is worse, the richness of medieval civilization is in no way brought home to the mind of the reader. Nor, as it appears, does Mr Guy himself seem to realize that medieval civilization was rich; hence his remark on p. 74 in relation to the Renaissance: "When men's minds stirred from their long sleep." But the great masters of scholasticism—and others outside its range like Chaucer—were not lacking in intellectual capacity or mentally dormant. What happened at the Renaissance was, to adopt Professor Butterfield's phrase, a "transposition of mind" which enabled men to put the old ideas in a new relationship, more especially in the

light of rediscovered classical learning. Nor is Mr Guy justified in disposing of Calvin in a few lines when he grants Luther as many pages, for in the Protestant Reformation Calvin's teaching is infinitely more important than that of Luther.

The remainder of the book is more balanced, though it may be questioned in passing whether Mr Guy has not tended to overemphasize the work of the Free Churches by comparison with that of other communions. All the same, to have covered Christian history in so brief a space is in itself an achievement, and so long as the master who uses this book supplements it with his own knowledge, it may be recommended as a useful introduction to the rise and expansion of the Christian Church.

V. H. H. Green.

Sherborne School.

Heirs of Tradition. By Robert Sencourt. Carroll and Nicholson. 15s.

Mr Sencourt has not yet written his autobiography. But his latest book is the next best thing. In it he tells us of the important people with whom he has come into contact since he came to England in 1911. He describes his upbringing in New Zealand, his admiration for the traditions of Europe and the Empire, and his meetings with first one and then another member of what he calls the "special circle of privilege and glamour." He admits that it was his ambition "to know and make his own the central glories of the Empire, and to have some of its distinguished people as friends." The imposing list of titled persons in the index shows that he has achieved his ambition.

The book takes the form of a series of character sketches, which include such varied personalities as George Gordon and H. A. L. Fisher, Lord Willingdon and Lord Chatfield, the Duke of Alba and Queen Marie of Rumania, and, in a final section on "the Church," Archbishop Davidson, Cardinal Hinsley, Cardinal Mercier, Lord Halifax, Bishop Underhill, and Pope Pius XI. They are seen as the heirs and representatives of a great tradition—European, Imperial and, above all, Christian. Mr Sencourt raises some of the burning issues of the present day: the future of the Empire, the position of Britain with her dual link with Europe and the Empire, the spread of Communism, and the need for a strong, united Church to preserve the things of the spirit from modern secularism. He has the cause of Christian unity very much at heart, and perhaps the most satisfying parts of his book are those in which he deals with the differences between the Roman Church and the Church of England, and shows that it is possible to combine allegiance to Rome with a real respect for the traditions of other Christians. Some of his judgments on recent events are surprising—for instance, his belief that Franco's cause in the Spanish war was a crusade, and his suggestion that von Papen represented the best element in Germany.

Perhaps this book is best regarded as a period piece. It takes us

back into an age of greater dignity and leisure, and portrays some of the people who lived in it. It will make a special appeal to those who enjoy personal reminiscences of great people and great events, and to those who like to escape now and then into a world which (for some people at any rate) was less crude and uncomfortable than that in which we live to-day.

W. D. MAUNDRELL.

CHICHESTER.

GOETHE DER MENSCH. By Hans Ehrenberg. Heliopolis Verlag, Tübingen.

This is yet another of the spate of books occasioned by the Goethe bicentenary. Dr Ehrenberg does not set out to make a new contribution to scholarship nor to offer a new interpretation of Goethe's life, but rather his essays represent variations on Goethe the man. It is an attempt to supply an answer to the question what Goethe the man can teach us in this twentieth century. While the book is essentially composed in an impressionistic vein and contains some suggestions and generalizations with which I should quarrel, it nevertheless reveals a thorough knowledge of Goethe's life and work, for it conveys the impression to the reader that the author has lived with Goethe for many years. His main concern appears to be to discern the human quality in Goethe's work. For him Goethe's prime importance lies in his insistence on the human foundations of thought. He rightly points out Goethe's endeavour to reconcile nature and man, science and art. What the author terms Goethe's biological or anthropological approach to science is, in his opinion, the most revolutionary and significant achievement of the great poet. Dr Ehrenberg then proceeds to maintain that, while other sciences have followed this trend, intuitively perceived by Goethe, theology has been lagging behind. He therefore stresses the need for a revolution in its sphere so as to place it on an anthropological basis. In Goethe he also discovered above all an apostle of the religion of healing to which as a complement, he feels, the religion of grace must be allied. He thus shows himself aware of Goethe's rather negative attitude towards Christianity. Whatever the values of some of these contentions, the author is right in pointing out the importance of Goethe's early religious experience in the shaping of his inner development. It is also not surprising that Dr Ehrenberg is fascinated by the human quality in Goethe, for it communicates itself in almost all the pages of his work. Perhaps the preoccupation with Goethe the man is not the most fruitful approach; nevertheless, no reader of Goethe can fail to be struck by his universality, by his insight into nature and man, by his success in tempering the storms that raged within him from early youth to the day of his death, by his ability to live a balanced life at a time when the forces now threatening our civilization were already becoming apparent. Goethe's impact may, indeed, be growing with the progress of time. The nature and depth of his understanding of life then will stand

out in greater and greater relief. While we must avoid the pitfall of making him an idol, we owe to Dr Ehrenberg another reminder of his concern for the spiritual welfare of man.

H. S. Reiss.
London School of Economics.

Dean Milman, 1791-1868. By Charles Smyth. S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d.

This brief study of "one of the forgotten intellectual giants of the nineteenth century" is well worth a modest place among the longer lives of those earlier Victorian divines who were also scholars, poets, and reviewers. Text and notes are both informative and stimulating. The inevitable brevity of what is something between a sermon and an essay ensures a triumph somewhat rare in ecclesiastical biography; the reader wishes that the author had printed much more of the material his researches have obviously unearthed. It is evident there are wide tracts explored by Canon Smyth in which he might have guided us with pleasure and profit—from the parochial history of Westminster to high matters of ecclesiastical polity and theological controversy. We should be glad to learn more of one whom a contemporary dean dared to say was "the foremost man in the world of mind" in the Church of his day, and was also "the unquestioned patriarch of English literature" among the survivors of the Romantic Age.

The reader must discover for himself the grounds for such apparently extravagant panegyric. He will recall other deans, and one result of the ensuing comparison will perhaps be a conviction that the deans of Victorian England together form a shining galaxy in the intellectual firmament. Alford, Farrar, and Wace at Canterbury, Church and Stanley, Gregory and Bradley in London, Hook of Chichester, Howson of Chester, Goulburn of Norwich, Boyle of Salisbury, Vaughan of Llandaff—these, too, and many another were giants in the intellectual and moral orders, men of letters and of religion, of refined taste and exact scholarship, diligent in rule yet gentle and pleasant in their lives, strong and vigorous in pulpit and on platform, fearless towards men yet in their private devotions and meditations simple and childlike towards God and their Saviour. It is good to be reminded that there were once such men as the subject of Canon Smyth's admirable monograph.

W. G. Addison.
Britford.

The Targum of Isaiah. Edited with a translation by J. F. Stenning. Clarendon Press. 30s.

The recent discovery in a Dead Sea cave of a very early Hebrew MS of the Book of Isaiah has not only aroused a new and widespread interest in the whole field of biblical archæology, but it has also given a welcome stimulus to the textual study of this great prophecy. The book under review, while not directly concerned with the new find or with the various problems it has posed, is a valuable contribution to the general study and understanding of the text of Isaiah.

Of chief interest and value to the specialist student of the biblical versions, this book will also serve the general reader in certain definite ways. The main body of the work (223 out of 255 pages) is devoted to the provision of what the editor calls "a critical edition of the Targum of Isaiah based on manuscript authority." The text is vocalized according to the superlinear method, with a view to giving fresh and reliable material for the determination of the original form of this system. On opposite pages to the text there is a translation into English, which will enable those unacquainted with Aramaic to see how early Jewish exegesis dealt with the biblical text. A short introduction explains how the Targumim came into being and how they differ from the other so-called ancient versions. There is also a useful chapter describing the characteristics of the Targum version, although it should be said that the greater part of this section demands a knowledge of Aramaic. Copious footnotes accompany the text and translation, setting forth clearly the variations of other MSS from that used in this edition (the Yemen MS in the British Museum—Or. 2211). Two short appendices give extracts from the Jerusalem Targum, showing how this often varied from the version which received its final form in Babylon.

Anyone who has experience of the careful and painstakingly thorough methods of the former Warden of Wadham will not be disappointed with his latest publication, representing as it does the result of many years' labour. It is a book which cannot be ignored by the serious student of Isaiah, and it should certainly find a place in all theological libraries.

C. Witton-Davies.

St David's.

How Stands Reunion? By Edward S. Woods. Lutterworth Press. 1s. 6d.

Most of the literature about church unity that is now published is addressed, if not to the converted, at any rate to the well informed. With exceptions here and there, the interest of ordinary church members has not yet been seriously engaged. The success of any reunion project, however, must largely depend on the extent to which the rank and file of church members are prepared and eager for it, and are aware of the difficulties that will be encountered when it comes into operation. The Bishop of Lichfield's booklet, which has this need in view, deserves a wide circulation. It is popularly written. It contains a great deal of factual information about what has happened during the last forty years. It is definite and eirenic, and moving without being sentimental.

Makers of Modern Thought. By Gwilym O. Griffith. Lutterworth Press. 15s.

Studies of Francis Bacon, Descartes, Spinoza, Kant, Rousseau, Comte, Marx, T. H. Huxley, and Freud. In each case the man's

thought is brought out in relation to his biography and historical background. A useful introduction to the formative ideas of the period since the Renaissance.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

ABINGDON-COKESBURY PRESS (NASHVILLE): E. Stanley Jones, *The Way to Power and Poise* ($1.25).

CHURCH BOOK ROOM PRESS: M. Guthrie Clark, *W. H. Griffith Thomas* (9d.), Max Warren, *Charles Simeon* (9d.).

CLONMORE AND REYNOLDS: John Jordan, C.S.Sp., *Bishop Shanahan of Southern Nigeria* (16s.).

FABER AND FABER: Nicolette Gray, *Jacob's Ladder: A Bible Picture Book from Anglo-Saxon and Twelfth-Century English MSS.* (21s.).

HUTCHINSON: A. D. Woozey, *Theory of Knowledge* (7s. 6d.).

INDUSTRIAL CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP: A. E. Baker, *Why Communism? and Why Not?* (1s.).

INTER-VARSITY FELLOWSHIP: Robert P. Wilder, *Guidance* (6d.).

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: Wilhelm Vischer, *The Witness of the Old Testament to Christ*, Vol. I (25s.); Gordon Hewitt, *Let the People Read: A Short History of the United Society for Christian Literature* (2s. 6d.); W. J. Culshaw, *Tribal Heritage: A study of the Santals* (21s.).

MACMILLAN: Martin Buber, *The Prophetic Faith* (17s. 6d.).

MOWBRAYS: G. E. Childs, *A Parson's Thoughts on Pain* (New Edition) (2s. 6d.); F. H. C. Tatham (Ed.), *The Wisdom of William Temple* (1s. 6d.); Kathleen E. Burne (Ed.), *The Wisdom of Father Andrew* (1s. 6d.); Anon., *My Day with Jesus: Prayers and Acts for Private Use* (2s.); S. P. T. Prideaux, *Thirty-Six Outline Sermons on General Subjects* (3s. 6d.).

NISBET: Sydney Cave, *The Christian Way* (16s.).

PICKERING AND INGLIS: J. B. Watson (Ed.), *The Church: A Symposium of Principles and Practice* (10s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K.: A. W. Lee, *Once Dark Country: Recollections and Reflections of a South African Bishop* (7s. 6d.); A. E. J. Rawlinson, *The Study of Christian Doctrine* (1s.); Mervyn Stockwood, *Christianity and Marxism* (2s.); N. Garton, *A Simple Index to the Gospels* (9d.); C. S. Phillips, *Canterbury Cathedral in the Middle Ages* (2s. 6d.)

S.P.C.K. (PUBLISHED FOR THE RELIGIOUS DRAMA SOCIETY): Freda Collins, *Cyprian: A Three-Act Play* (2s. 6d.).

UNITED SOCIETY FOR CHRISTIAN LITERATURE (COLOMBO): *Proposed Scheme of Church Union in Ceylon* (Re 1.50).

VANDENHOECK AND RUPRECHT (GÖTTINGEN): H. I. Iwand, *Göttingen Predigt-meditationen: Die Altkirchlichen Evangelien. Advent bis Estomihi* (n.p.).

C. A. WATTS AND CO.: P. Hadfield, *Traits of Divine Kingship in Africa* (8s. 6d.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher